

Counting carefree couples

Pieter Moree

Abstract

A pair of natural numbers (a, b) such that a is both squarefree and coprime to b is called a carefree couple. A result conjectured by Manfred Schroeder (in his book ‘Number theory in science and communication’) on carefree couples and a variant of it are established using standard arguments from elementary analytic number theory. Also a related conjecture of Schroeder on triples of integers that are pairwise coprime is proved.

1 Introduction

It is well known that the probability that an integer is squarefree is $6/\pi^2$. Also the probability that two given integers are coprime is $6/\pi^2$. (More generally the probability that n positive integers chosen arbitrarily and independently are coprime is well-known [8, 11, 15] to be $1/\zeta(n)$, where ζ is Riemann’s zeta function. For some generalizations see e.g. [1, 2, 6, 12, 13].) One can wonder how ‘statistically independent’ squarefreeness and coprimality are. To this end one could for example consider the probability that of two random natural numbers a and b , a is both squarefree and coprime to b . Let us call such a couple (a, b) *carefree*. If b is also squarefree, we say that (a, b) is a *strongly carefree* couple. Let us denote by $C_1(x)$ the number of carefree couples (a, b) with both $a \leq x$ and $b \leq x$ and, similarly, let $C_2(x)$ denote the number of strongly carefree couples (a, b) with both $a \leq x$ and $b \leq x$.

The purpose of this note is to establish the following result, part of which was conjectured, on the basis of heuristic arguments, by Manfred Schroeder at p. 54 of his famous book [14].

Theorem 1 *We have*

$$C_1(x) = \frac{x^2}{\zeta(2)} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p+1)}\right) + O(x \log x), \quad (1)$$

and

$$C_2(x) = \frac{x^2}{\zeta(2)^2} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{(p+1)^2}\right) + O(x \log^3 x). \quad (2)$$

The interpretation of Theorem 1 is that the probability for a couple to be carefree is

$$K_1 := \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p+1)}\right) \approx 0.42824950567709444022 \quad (3)$$

and to be strongly carefree is

$$K_2 := \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{(p+1)^2}\right) \approx 0.28674742843447873411 \quad (4)$$

Note that alternatively we can write

$$K_2 = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{2}{p(p+1)}\right) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{p}\right). \quad (5)$$

The constants K_1 and K_2 we could call the *carefree*, respectively *strongly carefree constant*, cf. [4, Section 2.5].

Assuming independence of squarefreeness and coprimality we would expect that $K_1 = \zeta(2)^{-2}$ and $K_2 = \zeta(2)^{-3}$. Now note that

$$K_1 = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^2} \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{1}{(p+1)(p^2-1)}\right), \quad K_2 = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)^3} \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{2p+1}{(p+1)^2(p^2-1)}\right).$$

We have $\zeta(2)^2 K_1 \approx 1.15876$ and $\zeta(2)^3 K_2 \approx 1.27627$. Thus, there is a positive correlation between squarefreeness and coprimality. We will get back to this in Section 2.

In the proof of Theorem 1 we will make use of the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *Let $d \geq 1$ be arbitrary. Put*

$$S_d(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (d,n)=1}} \mu(n)^2.$$

Then we have

$$S_d(x) = \frac{x}{\zeta(2) \prod_{p|d} (1 + \frac{1}{p})} + O(2^{\omega(d)} \sqrt{x}), \quad (6)$$

where $\omega(d)$ denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of d .

Proof. Let $T_d(x)$ denote the number of natural numbers $n \leq x$ that are coprime to d . We have

$$T_d(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n,d)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{\substack{\alpha|n \\ \alpha|d}} \mu(\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha|d} \mu(\alpha) \left[\frac{x}{\alpha}\right] = \frac{\varphi(d)}{d} x + O(2^{\omega(d)}). \quad (7)$$

By the principle of inclusion and exclusion we find that

$$S_d(x) = \sum_{\substack{m \leq \sqrt{x} \\ (d,m)=1}} \mu(m) T_d\left(\frac{x}{m^2}\right).$$

Hence, on invoking (7), we find

$$S_d(x) = x \frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{m \leq \sqrt{x} \\ (d,m)=1}} \frac{\mu(m)}{m^2} + O(2^{\omega(d)} \sqrt{x}).$$

and, hence, on completing the sum,

$$S_d(x) = x \frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ (d,m)=1}}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(m)}{m^2} + O(2^{\omega(d)} \sqrt{x})$$

Note that

$$\sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ (d,m)=1}} \frac{\mu(m)}{m^2} = \prod_{p \nmid d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(2) \prod_{p|d} (1 - 1/p^2)}.$$

Using this and $\varphi(d)/d = \prod_{p|d} (1 - 1/p)$ we finally obtain estimate (6). $\square$

Lemma 2 *We have*

$$\sum_{d \leq x} \frac{2^{\omega(d)}}{d} = O(\log^2 x), \quad \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{2^{\omega(d)}}{\sqrt{d}} = O(\sqrt{x} \log x), \quad \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{4^{\omega(d)}}{d} = O(\log^3 x).$$

Proof. This follows on invoking Theorem 1 at p. 201 of Tenenbaum's book [16] together with partial integration. $\square$

Remark. Let $d(n)$ denote the number of divisors of n . We have $2^{\omega(n)} \leq d(n)$ with equality iff n is squarefree. The above estimates also hold with $2^{\omega(n)}$ replaced by $d(n)$.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Note that

$$C_1(x) = \sum_{a \leq x} \sum_{b \leq x} \mu(a)^2 \sum_{d|a, d|b} \mu(d).$$

On swapping the summation order and using $[x/d] = x/d + O(1)$, we obtain

$$C_1(x) = x \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{a \leq x \\ d|a}} \mu(a)^2 + O(x \log x).$$

On noting that

$$\sum_{\substack{a \leq x \\ d|a}} \mu(a)^2 = \mu(d)^2 \sum_{\substack{n \leq x/d \\ (d,n)=1}} \mu(n)^2 = \mu(d)^2 S_d\left(\frac{x}{d}\right) \quad (8)$$

and $\mu(d) = \mu(d)^3$, we find

$$C_1(x) = x \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} S_d\left(\frac{x}{d}\right) + O(x \log x).$$

On using Lemma 1 we obtain the estimate

$$C_1(x) = \frac{x^2}{\zeta(2)} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2 \prod_{p|d} (1 + 1/p)} + O(\sqrt{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{2^{\omega(d)}}{d}) + O(x \log x).$$

On completing the latter sum and noting that

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2 \prod_{p|d} (1 + 1/p)} = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p+1)} \right),$$

we find

$$C_1(x) = \frac{x^2}{\zeta(2)} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p+1)} \right) + O(\sqrt{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{2^{\omega(d)}}{d}) + O(x \log x).$$

Estimate (1) now follows on invoking Lemma 2.

The proof of (2) is very similar to the proof of (1). We start by noting that

$$C_2(x) = \sum_{a \leq x} \sum_{b \leq x} \mu(a)^2 \mu(b)^2 \sum_{d|a, d|b} \mu(d).$$

On swapping the summation order, we obtain

$$C_2(x) = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{a \leq x \\ d|a}} \mu(a)^2 \sum_{\substack{b \leq x \\ d|b}} \mu(b)^2.$$

On noting that $\mu(d) = \mu(d)^5$ and invoking (8) we obtain

$$C_2(x) = \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) S_d \left(\frac{x}{d} \right)^2. \quad (9)$$

On using Lemma 1 we obtain the estimate

$$C_2(x) = \frac{x^2}{\zeta(2)^2} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2 \prod_{p|d} (1 + 1/p)^2} + O(\sqrt{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{2^{\omega(d)}}{\sqrt{d}}) + O(x \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{4^{\omega(d)}}{d}).$$

On completing the first sum and noting that

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2 \prod_{p|d} (1 + 1/p)^2} = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{(p+1)^2} \right),$$

we find

$$C_2(x) = \frac{x^2}{\zeta(2)^2} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{(p+1)^2} \right) + O(\sqrt{x} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{2^{\omega(d)}}{\sqrt{d}}) + O(x \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{4^{\omega(d)}}{d}).$$

On invoking Lemma 2 estimate (2) is then established. $\square$

Let us call a couple (a, b) with $a, b \leq x$, a and b coprime and either a or b squarefree, *weakly carefree*. A little thought reveals that $C_3(x) = 2C_1(x) - C_2(x)$. By Theorem 1 it then follows that the probability K_3 that a couple is weakly carefree equals $K_3 = 2K_1 - K_2 \approx 0.5697515829$.

2 Probabilistic aspects

These were already discussed to some extent in the introduction and there it was seen that there is a positive correlation between squarefreeness and coprimality. An examination of the proof of Theorem 1 shows the origin of the positive correlation. For conciseness sake, we describe this only for $C_2(x)$. Let d be squarefree. If the events $d|n$ and n is squarefree were to be statistically independent, then we would have

$$\sum_{\substack{a \leq x \\ d|n}} \mu(n)^2 = \sum_{\substack{m \leq x/d \\ (d,m)=1}} \mu(m)^2 \sim \frac{x}{\zeta(2)d} \sim \sum_{m \leq x/d} \mu(m)^2 \quad (10)$$

and this would lead, using equation (9), to $K_2 = 216/\pi^6 = \zeta(2)^{-3}$. If μ would be a completely multiplicative function, then (10) would hold true. However, μ is not completely multiplicative and as it is, we only have

$$\Sigma_1 := \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d|n}} \mu(n)^2 \leq \sum_{m \leq x/d} \mu(m)^2 := \Sigma_2$$

and in fact $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_1/\Sigma_2 < 1$ if $d > 1$. On invoking the inclusion and exclusion formula (9), this then leads one to expect a probability $K_2 > 216/\pi^6 = \zeta(2)^{-3}$.

3 Numerical aspects

The singular series appearing in Theorem 1 converge rather slowly. At present direct evaluation of the constants K_1 and K_2 through (3), respectively (4) yields only about five decimal digits of precision. By expressing K_1 and K_2 as infinite products involving $\zeta(k)$ for $k \geq 2$, they can be computed with high precision. To this end Theorem 1 of [9] can be used. The error analysis can be dealt with using Theorem 2 of [9]. Using [9, Theorem 1] it is inferred that

$$K_1 = \prod_{k \geq 2} \zeta(k)^{-e_k}, \text{ where } e_k = \frac{\sum_{d|k} b_d \mu(\frac{k}{d})}{k} \in \mathbb{Z},$$

with the sequence $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ defined by $b_0 = 2$ and $b_1 = -1$ and $b_{k+2} = -b_{k+1} + b_k$. Using the same theorem, it is seen that

$$K_2 = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{k \geq 2} \{\zeta(k)(1 - 2^{-k})\}^{-f_k}, \text{ where } f_k = \frac{\sum_{d|k} (-2)^d \mu(\frac{k}{d})}{k} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The reader who is interested in seeing more decimals of K_1 and K_2 is referred to <http://www.gn-50uma.de/alula/essays/Moree/Moree.en.shtml>.

4 Other occurrences of the carefree constants K_i

The constant K_1 also appears in the study of squarefree kernels. We have for example, see [3], $\sum_{n \leq x} k(n) = \zeta(2)x^2/2 + O(x^{3/2})$, where $k(n) = \prod_{p|n} p$ denotes

the squarefree kernel of the integer n .

The constant K_2 also appears in various results, for example

$$\sum_{n \leq x} 3^{\omega(n)} = \frac{K_2}{2} x (\log x)^2 + O(x \log x) \text{ and } \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)^2 2^{\omega(n)} = K_2 x \log x + O(x),$$

see [16, p. 53].

Let $I_3(x)$ denote the number of triples (a, b, c) with $a \leq x$, $b \leq x$, $c \leq x$ such that $(a, b) = (a, c) = (b, c) = 1$. Schroeder [14, Section 4.4] claims that $I_3(x) \sim K_2 x^3$. Indeed, in the next section we will prove the following result.

Theorem 2 *We have $I_3(x) = K_2 x^3 + O(x^2 \log^2 x)$.*

5 Proof of Theorem 2

Note that

$$I_3(x) = \sum_{a, b, c \leq x} \sum_{\substack{d_1 | a \\ d_1 | b}} \mu(d_1) \sum_{\substack{d_2 | a \\ d_2 | c}} \mu(d_2) \sum_{\substack{d_3 | b \\ d_3 | c}} \mu(d_3).$$

On writing $[n, m]$ for the least common multiple of n and m , we can rewrite the latter identity as

$$I_3(x) = \sum_{\substack{[d_1, d_2] \leq x \\ [d_1, d_3] \leq x \\ [d_2, d_3] \leq x}} \mu(d_1) \mu(d_2) \mu(d_3) \left[\frac{x}{[d_1, d_2]} \right] \left[\frac{x}{[d_1, d_3]} \right] \left[\frac{x}{[d_2, d_3]} \right].$$

Now put

$$J_1(x) = \sum_{\substack{[d_1, d_2] \leq x \\ [d_1, d_3] \leq x \\ [d_2, d_3] \leq x}} \frac{\mu(d_1) \mu(d_2) \mu(d_3)}{[d_1, d_2][d_1, d_3][d_2, d_3]}$$

and

$$J_2(x) = \sum_{\substack{[d_1, d_2] \leq x \\ [d_1, d_3] \leq x \\ [d_2, d_3] \leq x}} \frac{1}{[d_1, d_2][d_1, d_3]}.$$

Using that $[x] = x + O(1)$ we find that $I_3(x) = x^3 J_1(x) + O(x^2 J_2(x))$. We will show first that

$$J_1(x) = \sum_{d_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{d_2=1}^{\infty} \sum_{d_3=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d_1) \mu(d_2) \mu(d_3)}{[d_1, d_2][d_1, d_3][d_2, d_3]} + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x}\right).$$

To this end it is enough, by symmetry of the argument of the sum, to show that

$$\sum_{[d_1, d_2] > x} \frac{1}{[d_1, d_2][d_1, d_3][d_2, d_3]} = O\left(\frac{\log x}{x}\right). \quad (11)$$

Now let $(d_1, d_2) = \alpha$, $(d_1, d_3) = \beta$ and $(d_2, d_3) = \gamma$. Then $d_1 = [\alpha, \beta] \delta_1$, $d_2 = [\alpha, \gamma] \delta_2$, $d_3 = [\beta, \gamma] \delta_3$ with $(\delta_1, \delta_2) = (\delta_1, \delta_3) = (\delta_2, \delta_3) = 1$. Furthermore we must have $([\alpha, \beta], [\alpha, \gamma]) = \alpha$, etc.. From this it can be deduced that

$(\alpha/(\alpha, \beta, \gamma), \beta/(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)) = 1$, etc.. Write $u = \alpha\beta\gamma/(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)^2$. Then $[d_1, d_2] = u\delta_1\delta_2$, $[d_1, d_3] = u\delta_1\delta_3$ and $[d_2, d_3] = u\delta_2\delta_3$. Now

$$\sum_{[d_1, d_2] > x} \frac{1}{[d_1, d_2][d_1, d_3][d_2, d_3]} \leq \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^3} \sum_{\delta_1 \delta_2 > x/u} \frac{1}{(\delta_1 \delta_2 \delta_3)^2}.$$

The latter double sum is of order

$$O\left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^3} \sum_{\delta_1 \delta_2 > x/u} \frac{1}{(\delta_1 \delta_2)^2}\right) = O\left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^3} \sum_{n > x/u} \frac{d(n)}{n^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^2}\right),$$

where we used the well-known estimate $\sum_{n > x} d(n)n^{-2} = O(\log x/x)$. Now

$$\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^2} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)^4}{(\alpha\beta\gamma)^2} = O\left(\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\alpha', \beta', \gamma'} \frac{1}{(\alpha'\beta'\gamma')^2}\right) = O(1),$$

where we have written $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = d$, $\alpha = d\alpha'$, $\beta = d\beta'$ and $\gamma = d\gamma'$. Thus we have established equation (11).

In the same vein $J_2(x)$ can be estimated to be

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(x) &= O\left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \sum_{\substack{\delta_1 \delta_2 \leq x/u \\ \delta_1 \delta_3 \leq x/u \\ \delta_2 \delta_3 \leq x/u}} \frac{1}{[d_1, d_2][d_1, d_3]}\right) = O\left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^2} \sum_{\delta_1 \delta_2 \delta_3 \leq (x/u)^{3/2}} \frac{1}{\delta_1^2 \delta_2 \delta_3}\right) \\ &= O\left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^2} \sum_{\delta_2 \delta_3 \leq (x/u)^{3/2}} \frac{1}{\delta_2 \delta_3}\right) = O\left(\sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \frac{1}{u^2} \sum_{n \leq (x/u)^{3/2}} \frac{d(n)}{n}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Using the classical estimate $\sum_{n \leq x} d(n)/n = O(\log^2 x)$ one obtains $J_2(x) = O(\log^2 x)$. It remains to evaluate the triple infinite sum, which we rewrite as

$$\sum_{d_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{d_2=1}^{\infty} \sum_{d_3=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d_1)\mu(d_2)\mu(d_3)(d_1, d_2)(d_1, d_3)(d_2, d_3)}{(d_1 d_2 d_3)^2},$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{d_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d_1)}{d_1^2} \sum_{d_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d_2)(d_1, d_2)}{d_2^2} \sum_{d_3=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d_3)(d_1, d_3)(d_2, d_3)}{d_3^2}.$$

Note that the argument of the inner sum is multiplicative in d_3 . By Euler's product identity it is zero if $(d_1, d_2) > 1$ and $1/(\zeta(2) \prod_{p|d_1 d_2} (1 + 1/p))$ otherwise. Thus the latter triple sum is seen to yield

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \sum_{d_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d_1)}{d_1^2 \prod_{p|d_1} (1 + 1/p)} \sum_{\substack{d_2=1 \\ (d_1, d_2)=1}}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(d_2)}{d_2^2 \prod_{p|d_2} (1 + 1/p)},$$

the argument of the inner sum is multiplicative in d_2 and proceeding as before we finally evaluate the triple sum to equal

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{2}{p(p+1)} \right) = K_2.$$

The proof is concluded on invoking equation (5). $\square$

The above problem of estimating $I_3(x)$ has the following natural generalisation. Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer and let $I_k(x)$ be the number of k -tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ with $1 \leq a_i \leq x$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $(a_i, a_j) = 1$ for every $1 \leq i \neq j \leq k$. The number of k -tuples such that none of the gcd's is divisible by some fixed prime p is easily seen to be

$$\sim x^k \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^k + \frac{k}{p} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{k-1} \right) = x^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{k-1}{p}\right).$$

Thus, it seems plausible that

$$I_k(x) \sim x^k \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{k-1}{p}\right), \quad (x \rightarrow \infty). \quad (12)$$

For $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ (by Theorem 2 and equation (5)) this is true, however the author does not know how to prove this for arbitrary k .

6 Conclusion

In stark contrast to what experience from daily life suggests, (strongly) carefree couples are quite common...

Acknowledgement. The author likes to thank Steven Finch for bringing Schroeder's conjecture to his attention and his instigation to write down these results. I like to thank Tristan Freiberg for pointing out some references and helpful comments.

Disclaimer. Although this note is written in article form, it will not be submitted for publication (the results being easy exercises in elementary analytic number theory).

Remarks. This is a slightly changed version of the manuscript [10] that I put in 2000 on my homepage and was not intended for publication. In [10] the estimates (1) and (2) were established with error term $O(x^{5/3})$ instead of $O(x \log x)$, respectively $O(x \log^3 x)$. These weaker error terms were a consequence of having error term $O(d)$ instead of $O(2^{\omega(d)})$ in estimate (6) (resulting in an error term $O(d\sqrt{x})$ in estimate (6)). Theorem 2 was established in [10] with error term $O(x^{5/2})$. A slight modification of the argument yields the much sharper error term $O(x^2 \log^2 x)$ as it is given here.

The estimate (12) I suggested to hold for $I_k(x)$ indeed holds true, as was established by L. Tóth in 2002 [17]. More precisely he proved that, for $k \geq 2$, we have

$$I_k(x) = x^k \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{k-1}{p}\right) + O(x^{k-1} \log^{k-1} x). \quad (13)$$

Let $I_k^{(u)}(x)$ denote the number of k -tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ with $1 \leq a_i \leq x$ that are pairwise coprime and moreover satisfy $(a_i, u) = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. It is easy to see that

$$I_{k+1}^{(u)}(n) = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ (j,u)=1}}^n I_k^{(ju)}(n).$$

Note that $I_1^{(u)}(n) = T_u(n)$ can be estimated by (7). Then by recursion with respect to k an estimate for $I_k^{(u)}(n)$ can be established that implies (13).

In [7] Havas and Majewski considered the problem of counting the number of n -tuples of natural numbers that are pairwise not coprime. They suggested that the density of these tuples should be

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{\zeta(2)}\right)^{\binom{n}{2}}. \quad (14)$$

The probability that a pair of integers is not coprime is $1 - 1/\zeta(2)$. Since there are $\binom{n}{2}$ pairs of integers in an n -tuple, one might naively expect the probability for this problem to be as given by (14). However, I think it is far more likely that the answer (14) is false for every $n \geq 3$. T. Freiberg [5] studied this problem for $n = 3$ using my approach to estimate $I_3(x)$ (it seems that the recursion method of Tóth cannot be applied here). Freiberg showed that the density of triples (a, b, c) with $(a, b) > 1$, $(a, c) > 1$ and $(b, c) > 1$ equals

$$F_3 = 1 - \frac{3}{\zeta(2)} + 3K_1 - K_2 \approx 0.1742197830347247005,$$

whereas $(1 - 1/\zeta(2))^3 \approx 0.06$. Thus the guess of Havas and Majewski for $n = 3$ is false.

Some related open problems are as follows:

Problem 1

- a) *To compute the density of n -tuples such that at least k pairs are coprime.*
- b) *To compute the density of n -tuples such that exactly k pairs are coprime.*

Problem 2

To compute the density of n -tuples such that all pairs are not coprime.

References

- [1] J. Chidambaraswamy and R. Sitaramachandra Rao, On the probability that the values of m polynomials have a given g.c.d., *J. Number Theory* **26** (1987), 237–245.
- [2] E. Cohen, Arithmetical functions associated with arbitrary sets of integers, *Acta Arith.* **5** (1959), 407–415.
- [3] E. Cohen, Some asymptotic formulas in the theory of numbers, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **112** (1964), 214–227.
- [4] S.R. Finch, *Mathematical constants*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **94**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [5] T. Freiberg, The probability that 3 positive integers are pairwise noprime, unpublished manuscript.
- [6] J.L. Hafner, P. Sarnak and K. McCurley, Relatively prime values of polynomials. In: *A tribute to Emil Grosswald: number theory and related analysis*, 437–443, Contemp. Math. **143**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993.
- [7] G. Havas and B.S. Majewski, A hard problem that is almost always easy. Algorithms and computations (Cairns, 1995), Lecture Notes in Comput. Science **1004** (1995), 216–223.
- [8] D.N. Lehmer, An asymptotic evaluation of certain totient sums, *Amer. J. Math.* **22** (1900), 293–355.
- [9] P. Moree, Approximation of singular series and automata, *Manuscripta Mathematica* **101** (2000), 385–399.
- [10] P. Moree, Counting carefree couples, unpublished manuscript, 2000.
- [11] J.E. Nymann, On the probability that k positive integers are relatively prime, *J. Number Theory* **4** (1972), 469–473.
- [12] J.E. Nymann, On the probability that k positive integers are relatively prime. II, *J. Number Theory* **7** (1975), 406–412.
- [13] S. Porubský, On the probability that k generalized integers are relatively H -prime, *Colloq. Math.* **45** (1981), 91–99.
- [14] M.R. Schroeder, *Number theory in science and communication*, 2nd edition, Springer Series in Information Sciences **7**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1986.
- [15] J.J. Sylvester, *The collected papers of James Joseph Sylvester*, vol. III, Cambridge Univ. Press, London, New York, 1909.
- [16] G. Tenenbaum, *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **46**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [17] L. Tóth, The probability that k positive integers are pairwise relatively prime, *Fibonacci Quart.* **40** (2002), 13–18.

Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik, Vivatsgasse 7, D-53111 Bonn, Germany.
e-mail: moree@mpim-bonn.mpg.de